



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ADDITION TO PP. 184-192 ABOVE

Since my article was written and in print, there has come to hand the January number of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, containing an article by Sayce on "The Hittite Language of Boghas Keui," from which it appears that Part I of Hrozny's publication of the Hittite texts, with translation and commentary, came out in 1919. Sayce credits Hrozny with "great acumen and a genius for discerning the general signification of a passage even where his philological analysis of it must be corrected," remarks that "his discovery of the various forms of the personal pronouns is the most brilliant part of his work," and accepts his identification of the personal endings of the verb (some of which he, Sayce, had already discovered). But he criticizes him severely for starting with the theory that the Hittite language was Indo-European, "thereby marring his work of decipherment, which is solid and brilliant as long as he keeps clear of this 'Indo-Germanic' theory." Several of Sayce's criticisms apply to word comparisons which my article passed over as worthless as evidence. But he also rejects Hrozny's comparison with Indo-European, while accepting his interpretation as sound, in the case of *wa-a-tar* 'water,' *kuiš* 'who,' *kuid* 'what,' and other pronominal forms (some of the specific arguments, however, that he urges as positive disproof of Indo-European connection are as captious or misleading as are some of Hrozny's arguments in favor of Indo-European connection in other cases). Only "the verbal forms are more serious," and here he recognizes the agreement between the Hittite and Indo-European forms, adding, however, that the forms are not peculiar to Indo-European (he quotes some partially similar endings in Vannic and Sumerian), and that "moreover, the suffixes of the Hittite verb are not always distinguished from one another in sense as they would be in Indo-European."

Sayce is, of course, justified in his sharp criticism of Hrozny's too ready assumption that Hittite was an Indo-European language, and he finds signs that Hrozny himself is now no longer so sure as he was of the purely Indo-European character of Hittite. On the other hand, he speaks of the "indubitably Indo-European element in the Boghas Keui texts," and his own conclusion is, as formerly, "that Hittite was a mixed language, and that the coincidences between Hittite and Indo-European prove nothing more than geographical contact and mutual influence." Now in my article I indicated that, in view of the non-Indo-European character of the Hittite vocabulary, it could only be a question in the main of an Indo-European morphological element, which, if substantiated, would present a peculiar type of mixture in the language. Such an Indo-European element Sayce recognizes, though in no such measure as Hrozny. In any case, the existence of an Indo-European inflectional element, as in the verb forms, is something not to be so lightly disposed of as the borrowing of isolated words.

In saying that "in the case of a mixed language it is the vocabulary that is the borrowed element in the first instance, not the inflectional system," I was only voicing what has long been the general opinion among scholars, based on wide observation and inherent probability, and which has recently been most lucidly expounded by Meillet in his interesting discussion with Schuchardt on the relationship of languages (Meillet, *Scientia*, XV [1914], 403 ff.; *Bull. Soc. Ling.*, LXVI [1918]; Schuchardt, *Nord. Tidsskrift for Filol.*, 4 Raekke, VI, 145 ff.; *Ber. Berl. Akad.*, 1917, pp. 518 f.). Even Schuchardt agrees that this is generally true, though urging that there are cases where there is morphological mixture and also where it is as futile to distinguish between indigenous and borrowed as to argue whether (to change his comparison to one more familiar) the Mississippi below St. Louis is a continuation of the Mississippi with influx of the Missouri, or vice versa. He notes the fact, as does Meillet, that the Gypsies of Armenia speak Armenian with a Gypsy vocabulary, and gives various other illustrations of peculiar mixture. For another, one may cite Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, who gives a few instances in which Turkish personal endings are appended to Greek forms, e.g., first plur.: κομούμστυ (νιζ), second plur.: κοιμάστυ (νιζ). These Greek dialects are thoroughly impregnated with elements of the dominant Turkish, and it is not remarkable that bilinguals have carried over into their Greek speech even some of the inflectional elements of Turkish. It remains true that such an admixture of inflectional elements occurs only under conditions of the most intensive contact, if not actual fusion, of peoples. It is something quite different from what we commonly have in mind when we speak of "borrowed elements," which may result from relatively loose contact. Hence an Indo-European inflectional element in Hittite, if admitted, whether we view it as a substratum, as I have suggested, or otherwise, is in any case of greater significance than would be a corresponding amount of Indo-European in the vocabulary for the rôle of Indo-European speech in Asia Minor. As for that, Sayce goes even to extremes when he asserts that "the Indo-European languages must have been molded into their leading forms, not in Europe or Central Asia, but in Asia Minor."

CARL D. BUCK